



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,412	04/10/2007	Riccardo Palumbo	D-43749-01	8362
28236	7590	01/05/2010		
LAW DEPARTMENT SEALED AIR CORPORATION P.O. BOX 464 DUNCAN, SC 29334				
EXAMINER				
KRUER, STEFAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3654				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/05/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/588,412

Applicant(s)

PALUMBO, RICCARDO

Examiner

Stefan Krueer

Art Unit

3654

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33 - 45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33 - 45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5108)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20090921
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 33 – 34 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill (4,796,412) in view of view of Soubeyrand et al (FR 2581633).

Re: **Claims 33 – 34**, O'Neill discloses a spool assembly for winding-up two adhesive carrier tapes (3, 4) of a packaging taped bag chain (2a – 2c) in an apparatus for taking up succession of packaging bags, the spool assembly (5 – 23) comprising:

- At least two spools (8, 9), wherein each spool comprises a core with a core surface (understood, for feature of affording a "drive dog" (11, 12) respective of each spool for common drive by a "differential drive");
- wherein the spool assembly comprises a differential gear unit (16 - 20) positioned between said spools, said differential gear unit removably connectable to a shaft (15, via disassembly) of a bag loader whereby the at least two carrier tapes can be wound up on said spools with equal tension (Col. 2, L. 35); and
- wherein said *spool assembly* is contained in a housing (10, 13); however,

O'Neill is silent with respect to said core of each spool comprising walls forming a race as well as said core of each spool comprising resilient means for releasing radial pressure acting on the turns of said tape.

Attention is directed to Soubeyrand et al who teach their resilient means (7, Fig. 5) for releasing a radial pressure on turn of tape (4) for features of promoting releasability of said tape during unwinding as well as minimizing a telescoping of said tape during winding or upon the conclusion of winding (Page 3, L. 13 - 21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference of O'Neill with the teaching of Soubeyrand et al to insure a proper winding of

a material for quality control and production efficiencies.

However, Soubeyrand et al are silent with respect to their core (2) comprising walls forming a race.

Though O'Neill and Soubeyrand et al are silent with respect to a core of their respective spool comprising walls forming a race, such is well known in the art to maintain a tape along a desired plane of movement during winding/unwinding as well as protection of said tape.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide walls forming a race on the spool of O'Neill as modified by Soubeyrand et al for guiding and maintaining a tape in a desired plane of winding/unwinding for operating efficiency and quality control.

Re: **Claim 39**, O'Neill discloses wherein said spool assembly is contained in a housing (10, 13).

Claims 35 – 38 and 40 - 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill (4,796,412) in view of view of Soubeyrand et al (FR 2581633) and in further view of Osborne (GB 2,064,477 A).

Re: **Claims 35 and 40**, O'Neill discloses each of their spools has a recess (for accepting respectively 11 and 12) in a surface and the prior art of placing a differential gear intermediate two coaxial spools (Col. 1, L. 36 - 49); however, O'Neill is silent with respect to his recess faces an other of said spools.

Soubeyrand et al teach their spool having a recess; however, Soubeyrand et al are silent with respect to an assembly of at least two or more spools.

Attention is directed to Osborne as reviewed by O'Neill who teaches an apparatus for taking bags carried by a pair of carrier tapes (3, 5, Fig. 2), two carrier tape winding spools (11, 13) positioned coaxially with one another and a differential gear unit (17, Pg. 1, L. 71) positioned between said spools, said differential gear unit provided to wind the tapes with equal tension (Pg. 1, L. 35 – 43).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of O'Neill and Soubeyrand et al with the teaching of Osborne to position the spools coaxially and placing the differential system between the spools to as an alternative arrangement for placing or rearranging the parts to provide equal tension to the tapes. Furthermore, it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70.

Re: **Claims 36, 41 – 42 and 45**, O'Neill discloses each spool having a recess where the differential gear unit 13 (using 11 and 12) is positioned in the recesses; however, O'Neill is silent with respect to his recess faces an other of said spools.

Soubeyrand et al teach their spool having a recess; however, Soubeyrand et al are silent with respect to an assembly of at least two or more spools.

Attention is directed to Osborne who teaches his spools as co-axially mounted and a differential gear positioned intermediate said spools, wherein a recess of a surface of one of said spools faces the recess of a surface of the other said spools, whereby a bevel gear (16, 21) of O'Neill would be formed integrally with his spools (8, 9, respectively).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of O'Neill and Soubeyrand et al with the teachings of Osborne to provide an alternative arrangement wherein the spools are attached independently to the assembly, yet maintaining equal tension to said tapes, for preference of tapes requiring ancillary (external) treatment during winding.

Re: **Claims 37 and 43**, O'Neill discloses wherein said differential gear unit comprises a core (area bordered by bevel gears 14, 16 and 21 – 22) and at least one "satellite pinion gear" (17, 18, Col. 25 – 26, "... orbiting around the horizontal common axis...") attached to said core and positioned to mesh with each bevel gear.

Re: **Claims 38 and 44**, O'Neill discloses the differential gear unit (13) comprises a mating hole (to accept 14) for mating with a shaft (drive of 15) of a bag holder.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 21 September 2009 with respect to **Claim 33** have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The rejections of the previous office action were in response to the claim language. Applicant's arguments are based primarily on the problem that Soubeyrand et al is directed to solving, notably minimizing the telescoping of wound material that is attributable to temperature differentials over time, whereas the instant invention addresses the short-term winding and discarding of wound material.

Nevertheless, the instant invention is concerned with the formation of a properly wound reel for which the instant invention integrates "... a resilient means for releasing a radial pressure on the turns of the tape that have been wound..." for which attention was directed to Soubeyrand et al for teaching the use of a resilient means along a core surface for similarly releasing a radial pressure on the turns of a tape.

That Soubeyrand et al incorporates such for reason of minimizing telescoping of wound tape attributable to temperature differentials of said tape over time, does not obviate the relevance of their teachings in assuring a properly wound reel of tape.

In as much as the reference of Stoubeyrand et al is drawn from a related art, a consideration of Stoubeyrand et al is reasonable.

Furthermore, applicant has not stated that the combination of O'Neill and Stoubeyrand et al would not function.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Carson et al (US 20020130058 A1), Fiorentino et al (3,295,778), Rengo (2,494,106), Rippin (4,421,283), Yokoe (4,739,945), Vincent (5,354,012) and Carlson (3,737,028) are cited for references of apparatuses and elements of relevance to features of the instant invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stefan Kruer whose telephone number is 571.272.5913. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Q. Nguyen, can be reached on 571.272.6952. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571.273.8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866.217.9197 (toll-free).

/Stefan Kruer/

Examiner, Art Unit 3654

02 January 2010

/John Q. Nguyen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3654